

REMARKS

By this amendment, a formal drawing sheet is being submitted, along with minor changes to the text in conformance therewith.

By this amendment, the limitations of claims 2 and 5 have been added to claim 1, and those claims have been canceled. As claim 2 was rejected only over Morgan ('131) and claim 5 was rejected only over Espinoza ('398), claim 1 as amended should be deemed allowable. That being said, it is Applicant's position that the Examiner's interpretation of the cited prior art is incorrect. For example, regarding now canceled claim 2, the Examiner's argument is that the Morgan device "has two wheels which rotate and are capable of being used to bring the edges of a wound together." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The "wheels" 9 of Morgan are simply the ends of a spool, which remain at a fixed distance, and are therefore incapable of pulling the edges of a wound together, notwithstanding the fact that there is no teaching or suggestion in Morgan for such a purpose. Similarly, with regard to claim 4, the Examiner's interpretation that the face of wheels 9 are "manually operated buttons" is unjustified and without support. With regard to Espinoza, apart from other differences, the device holds wax, and not glue. It is well settled that claims must be interpreted not only in light of Applicant's disclosure, but also utilizing the interpretations and meanings that one of ordinary skill in the art would impart. Arguing that the tweezers of Espinoza, to the extent that the device represents analogous art, are capable of wound closure, is inconsistent with the evidence in this case.

Based upon the foregoing amendments and comments, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John G. Posa, Reg. No. 37,424

GIFFORD, KRASS, GROH, SPRINKLE,

ANDERSON & CITKOWSKI, P.C.

2701 Troy Center Drive, Suite 330

Post Office Box 7021

Troy, Michigan 48007-7021

(734) 913-9300 (734) 913-6007 (Fax)